

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/685,525 | Applicant(s) BAUMANN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Ana L. Woodward | Art Unit 1711 | |

All Participants:

(1) Ana L. Woodward.

(2) Mr. Harris A. Pitlick.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 July 2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

23

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon further reconsideration, it appeared that claim 23 was still rejectable over Mumcu et al given that the instant specification defines a sufficient amount of titanium dioxide to reduce the thermal sensitivity as being an amount of 0.01-30% by weight. In the reference, the titanium dioxide pigment is used in an amount of 1 to 30% by weight..